

## REMARKS

The following remarks are provided in response to the Advisory Action (“office action”) mailed March 11, 2008 in which the Advisory Action maintained the following rejections:

- rejected claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by US patent 7,134,138 to Scherr (hereinafter Scherr) and further in view of US patent 7,194,762 to Challener et al. (hereinafter Challener).

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

### Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Scherr in view of Challener.

Independent claims 1 and 9, from which claims 2, 4-8, 10 and 12-16 depend, has been amended to include the element, “*the delegated environment is an environment to which the master owner token is not communicated.*” (See Applicants’ specification, p. 6, lines 24-26; p. 10, line 20 – p. 11, line 9; Figure 2.) Independent claim 17, from which claims 18 and 20 depend, recites a similar element.

Scherr fails to disclose “the delegated environment is an environment to which the master owner token is not communicated.” A portion of Scherr does disclose using “a master token [] to identify and authenticate a data access manager that creates and distributes [] host tokens used to identify and authenticate host computers.” (See Scherr,

col. 5, lines 50-53.) It is noted that this portion of Scherr is silent with respect to communicating the master token. However, Scherr goes on to disclose, with respect to the same embodiment, that both the master token and the host token are, in fact, communicated to the host environment. For example, Scherr states,

“In step **104**, the data access manager **28** *communicates the master token 42 to the hosts 22* . . . . In step **106**, the data access manager **28** communicates the host tokens **43** to the hosts **22**.” (Emphasis added.) (See Scherr, col. 8, lines 1-33, and corresponding Figure 2.)

Thus, **Scherr discloses a host environment to which both a master token and a host token are communicated**, whereas the Applicants teach and claim a delegated environment wherein “the delegated environment is an environment to which the master owner token is not communicated.”

Challenger is relied on merely to disclose a system that “comprises a security chip, such as a Trusted Platform Module.” As such, Challenger fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Scherr. Thus, **neither Scherr nor Challenger, alone or in combination, disclose “the delegated environment is an environment to which the master owner token is not communicated,”** as taught and claimed by the Applicants.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20.

### CONCLUSION

The Applicants submit that they have overcome the office action's rejections of the claims and that they have the right to claim the invention as set forth in the listed claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, L.L.P.

April 7, 2008

Date

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
Telephone: (503) 439-8778  
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073

/Justin K. Brask/

Justin K. Brask  
Reg. No. 61,080